RRR
ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT

MAY 1995 VOLUME VI, NUMBER 4

Resist, Revolt, and Rebuild

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

The essence of government is coercion. It is also, as Washington, D.C., has shown us, arbitrary and capricious confiscation of property without due process, the shooting of innocent political dissidents, and the mass burning of civilians.

If we want to regain our liberty, we have to do much more than limit the government we have. We must alter it fundamentally, with severe institutional, demographic, and geographic limits on its ability to coerce.

One way we can begin this is by opposing the further concentration of power in the Executive Branch, the heart and soul of coercive power. The Constitution guarded against this, with the enumerated powers.

As a backup, we had the Bill of Rights, which restricted the federal government's dealings with individuals: it couldn't take your property, it couldn't take your gun, it couldn't tell you what to say or what to think, it couldn't put government agents in your house, and it couldn't make you worship the god of the state.

But once the Executive Branch exceeded its enumerated powers, and the courts and Congress approved, that restriction became far less meaningful. We still had the Bill of Rights, until New Deal jurisprudence twisted its meaning entirely. Once meant to apply only to the federal government, it was applied to the states and enforced against the states. The Bill of Rights became an instrument of centralization instead of an institutional barrier against consolidated government.

Still other restrictions on centralized power were swept away. The framers set up the Senate as an agent of the state legislatures. The Senate protected the rights of the states and the people of the states against Washington, D.C.

In a dreadful change typical of the Progressive Era, the 17th amendment forced the direct election of senators. No longer were they responsible to the states. The Senate became responsible to the mass of voters, and predictably controlled by special interests. A key part of the federalist system had been smashed.

After all this, consolidation was nearly complete. But at least we had the House of Representatives. It was and is the only part of the government that is responsive to public opinion. It can be swayed by telephone calls and letters. You have the chance to meet and influence your representative. To retain his seat, he must meet regularly with real people in his district.

The Executive branch consists of two million unelected bureaucrats. The Judiciary has tyrants for life. The Senate is an accumulation of power brokers for the power elite. But the House represents the people—not all the time, not most of the time, but some of the time. The House provides the one avenue left to us to make peaceful change in government. Its power is the power of the purse.

It is only the House that can take up such issues as the abuses of the tax police, the BATF, the FBI, and the CIA. If we ever get real change in this country, it will be through this branch of Congress.

This used to be common wisdom in conservative circles. It was conservatives who warned of the Imperial Executive of Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Johnson. Even as late as the mid-seventies, conservatives continued to champion the rights of Congress over the rights of the White House. But with Reagan in office, that began to change. Suddenly we began to see complaints about the "Imperial Congress."

IN THIS ISSUE

P.C. Watch 7
by L.H.R., Jr.

The Ascent of the Kristols 9
by Paul Gottfried

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This rhetoric was disingenuous, designed to give Reagan an excuse for expanding government. Unfortunately many rank-and-file conservatives took it seriously. They have thus been left intellectually unprepared to deal with the step-up in centralization that is occurring under the Republican leadership, as the legislature is further weakened and the Executive further strengthened.

Let's consider, for example, whether civil rights laws should apply to the Congress. In the past, Congress has been exempt because the Constitution separates the powers of government. The Executive cannot be allowed to lord it over individual legislators.

Gingrich and Clinton are co-managers of the world's biggest government.

The exemption was a way of preventing some Executive extortion, bribery, and blackmail. No matter how a Congressman voted, he would never face retaliation from the dictatorial Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Clinton hasn't even signed the bill passed by the House by a nearly unanimous vote as promised in the Contract With America, and already, conservative Congressman are being harassed. For example, Steve Stockman, one of the best of the freshmen in the House, likes to hold a daily prayer session for his staff. They gather around, read a passage from Scripture, ask the Lord's blessing on their day, and then go about their business.

Stockman has now been warned by the ACLU, with the backing of the Justice Department, that he is violating the Civil Rights Act.

This is only the beginning. We are going to see the entire panoply of affirmative action and quotas enforced against Congressmen who dare to disagree with prevailing elite opinion. The National Right to Work Foundation warned that applying these laws to Congress might even result in a unionized Congressional staff.

This part of the "Contract" was a violation of the Constitutional doctrine of separation of powers, and a massive step up in the power of the Executive Branch over the Congress. Yet every mainstream conservative organ of opinion celebrated it.

Next we were dragged through weeks of debate on the Balanced Budget Amendment, which is either unenforceable (which means it is stupid) or is enforceable only by the federal judiciary (which means it is evil). The budget could be balanced tomorrow if taxes were raised high enough. To ward against that, some Republicans pushed for requiring all tax increases to be approved by a two-thirds majority. That provision had its own problems (taxes could be renamed as fees), but it was an improvement. Newt Gingrich, however, saw to it that the provision failed.

We think we have it bad with federal judges imposing tax increases at the state level. Imagine if they could do this for the entire country.

Few Republicans were smart enough to see this problem. Those who were smart enough kept their silence because they favor judicial tyranny. It took Sam Nunn of Georgia to blow the whistle. He pushed for a vote on an amendment that would have stripped away from federal judges the ability to enforce the amendment.

The neoconservatives balked. They saw the Nunn correction as stripping the teeth from the amendment. Far from viewing judicial enforcement as a weakness, they saw it as the essential purpose of the bill. It's interesting that they hadn't advertised this so-called strength before. More sensible minds prevailed, the Nunn amendment passed, the Balanced Budget Amendment failed, and thank goodness.

Consider also the line-item veto, passed by the House. As the *New York Times* said for the first time, and only after the vote was taken, this bill surrenders some of the power of the purse. It gives the president a legal right to tailor spending bills in any way he wishes. He can target anyone's district for a cutoff of federal funds, tax abatements, or regulatory changes. It gives him veto power over your representative's wishes, even when they have been ratified by the entire legislative body.

Nobody knows the full effect of this shift in fiscal weight. But we do know that it gives the president power that he was not given in the Constitution. We also know that individual Congressmen can now be reduced to a marginal status with the stroke of a presidential pen.

Now let's look at term limits, which Gingrich is blaming the Democrats for killing. If so, good for the Democrats. This would not have given us a citizen legislature as the advocates claim. It would have empowered the permanent bureaucracy at the expense of our elected representatives, thereby giving new power to the Executive Branch. Not that term limits are all bad. We need them for the Supreme Court and the bureaucrats, not for the people we can toss out at will.

Why would Gingrich and the Republican elite favor all these increased powers for the Executive Branch? Because they do not believe in economic liberty or self government. Gingrich and Clinton are, after all, co-managers of the world's biggest government running the world's most elaborate central plan, and we need to think about real changes to reduce it to rubble. Can

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we succeed? It's a matter of time, and a matter of will.

Recall that only a few years ago, at the height of the Bush administration, we were told that it was a new era of political stability. The Cold War was over and all important questions about economics and politics had been answered. We had arrived at the perfect mix between socialism and capitalism, between centralism and decentralism, between total management and laissez-faire. Now the system only needed to be managed.

Under this model of government, our job was to pay our taxes, defer to the state and its allies, and obey their every dictate. The only issue left for the voters to decide was what style of hairdo our managers should wear—Bush's traditional or Clinton's teased.

All that changed, and radically so, with the appearance of a guy with bad hair, Ross Perot. Forget about the particulars of his political philosophy, whatever they might be. People supported him less for what he believed or who he was, than for what he did ***not*** believe and who he was ***not***.

Perot was not part of the ruling regime. Both Bush and Clinton were. Perot was not a career politician. Both Bush and Clinton were. Perot did not believe in the status quo. Both Bush and Clinton did. Despite a hysterical media and political campaign against him, Perot decided the election.

This was the most important event in modern politics until November's election unleashed a torrent of anti-government ideology. Much more than the two-party system is breaking down. The entire structure of the modern political order is falling apart. Traditional coalitions are being shattered. The chasm between the ruled and the rulers is growing deeper and wider every day. The structure of authority as we know it will not and cannot last.

Civic texts lead us to believe that under our democracy, there can never be any question of the state's absolute authority, because it is granted and approved by the people at large. During elections, we were all taught, the public gets to determine the outcome and implicitly places its stamp of approval on whatever follows. This is a far from the case. Elections serve as a measure of public dissatisfaction with the present regime. They do not provide enforceable marching orders for the conduct of policy.

The great political philosophers point to much more interesting conflicts that lie at the foundation of every society with a government, whether the government is totalitarian or democratic. There is always a conflict of interest between the rulers and ruled, because the rulers are not productive. They live off the productivity of others. Whether through taxes, inflation, borrowing, or the spoils of war, the rulers are moochers. The state and groups connected to it live at other's expense, while those unconnected to the state are productive but see the fruits of their labors confiscated. That's why the growth of the state creates a conflict of interest in society which only grows worse once it begins.

The chasm between the ruled and the rulers is growing deeper and wider every day.

In voluntary trade, all parties gain. But in the business of government, one person's gain is another's loss. That is why the rulers and tax-consumers always seek to expand their rule by amassing more wealth, which requires more power, which in turn requires more coercion.

The more successful the government becomes at looting the public, the more it antagonizes successful people unconnected to the state. The ruled want to keep their earnings and otherwise be left alone. They want to keep the rulers at arms length politically and economically.

The trick of government is to sustain a power that, in reality, can collapse at anytime if the subjects do not cooperate. The government cannot accomplish this solely through coercion, because the ruled so outnumber the rulers. It must also seek some measure of approval.

Government and its interest groups sustain themselves only by soliciting some degree of consent. In this sense, we can say that all governments govern by implied agreement. When that agreement is removed—as it has been in many places throughout history—a revolution occurs, and the regime is immediately overthrown.

This is the great truth of political science which we are not supposed to know or think about, much less talk or write about. No government is permanent. No government is absolutely secure. No people are forced to suffer tyranny indefinitely. If this truth does become widely known, the regime has already entered dangerous territory. This truth explains the apparent paradox that revolutions are more likely to occur under mild despotisms than fierce ones.

It wasn't the murderous Stalin but the incompetent Gorbachev who was overthrown. Before that, it wasn't the tyrant Peter the Great who was tossed out, but the weak Nicholas II. In England, it wasn't HenryVIII but Charles I. In America, the right of Woodrow Wilson and FDR to rule was never in doubt, though they drastically increased government tyranny. The weak and bumbling Clinton administration, however, has inspired an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entire nation to question the legitimacy of the central state itself.

When we understand this, we can see why the ruling elites are panicked. November 1994 brought us the biggest explosion of anti-government sentiment in this century. The managerial elites, always fearful of their position and anxious to stamp out a challenge to their rule, see this as a grave problem. That is why they have attempted to orchestrate a smooth landing to the nation's anti-government flight.

The governing elite of both parties have a vested interest in making sure that consent is never withdrawn. If a tyrannical elite wants to maintain its control, it must find ways of channeling people's anger at government.

There are a number of other tactics the government uses to maintain control that go beyond sheer force. It can co-opt people through social insurance schemes and handouts. It can redirect peoples' attention away from those who tax and loot them here at home to foreign enemies. It can manufacture phony economic and social crises to bolster the legitimacy of its rule and central plans.

In the American system, the party system serves the purpose of channeling voter anger under normal circumstances. Every four years, people are allowed to choose between the two. Yet the leadership of the two political parties provide only the appearance, not the reality, of partisanship. They provide two flavors of the same tyranny. You can choose one, the other, or be indifferent. But you cannot express a more fundamental choice. There is no "none of the above" in the American system of voting.

The Republican Party is the vehicle that taxpayers chose to express their disgust this past November. The Republicans now control both Houses of Congress, and therefore the government's purse strings. But after the "100 days" (Gingrich is ever the Rooseveltian), we have no spending or regulatory cuts, with the prospect of only tiny tax cuts. And Gingrich wants to spend *more* on overseas spying and military adventures.

What about the rest of the Republicans' legislation? Their so-called crime bill federalizes crimes and removes constitutional restraints on federal police to search and spy on American businesses and individuals. The only crimes their bill targets are violations of government taxes and regulations, not crimes against person or property.

In fact, the federal government clamps down on any community that attempts to prevent actual crime. Earlier this year, when the retailers of Union Point, Georgia, drew up a list of 21 brazen local shoplifters, and barred them from their stores, the Justice Department intervened. Janet Reno is investigating not crimes against property, but supposed racial discrimination and the "right" to enter a business when you're a habitual thief.

What about welfare reform, which sends block grants to the states? It is worse than worthless. It apportions money based on how many welfare recipients there are in a state. The more people on welfare, the more money the state gets. That increases the incentive to put and keep people on welfare. The Republican bill has created a new constituency for welfare programs. And it maintains federal control over the states, not diminishes it. Nor will one bureaucrat in D.C. lose his job.

The only decent sentences in the Contract With America involve a very few small tax cuts. Leaders in both parties worried that a tax-cut bidding war would break out during the revolutionary atmosphere of January. So they jointly agreed on a cooling off period. They froze out the public and its concerns.

Meanwhile a split has occurred in the Republican Party. Though this has received virtually no attention from the press, the 73 freshmen are somewhat disgruntled with the Speaker and the direction he is taking the new Congress. They weren't elected to send $50 billion to Mexico to prop up that government, U.S. banks, and Wall Street. They went there to hack away at what they have hated throughout their professional lives: taxes, spending, regulations, and the social welfare empire run by D.C.

The Speaker is doing his best to marginalize them, to keep their bills from coming up in committee or on the floor, and to prevent them from having a voice in the conduct of the new Congress. This is not what the backbenchers expected when they voted for him as Speaker. They didn't bother to examine his terrible voting record in every area from environmental policy to foreign aid to social welfare.

The ideological split within the Republicans Party is deeper than that between Gingrich and Clinton.

The ideological split within the Republicans Party is deeper than that between Gingrich and Clinton. Why, then, haven't we heard much about it? Why are we kept in the dark about such remarkable developments? Why do we have to subscribe to newsletters or read the mainstream press with a Kremlinological eye to know about such things?

This leads me to the role of propaganda, another key to sustaining the government's legitimacy. The central state needs people who are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not widely seen as its direct tools to bless the enterprise as necessary, wise, and just. Throughout history, various people have played the role of state propagandists. Today, it is secular intellectuals.

The federal government has its own propaganda organs, of course, and they cost billions every year. But there is also a huge network of outsiders who also work to prop up the state, to suppress news about important events, and to invent new rationales for state power.

This network includes the academic establishment, the big media, Hollywood, many of the churches and the national church organizations, the corporate elite, the legal elite, big medicine, the large foundations, the big banks, the Beltway think tanks, and the New York publishing houses. Together they reinforce and propagate a culture of statism that makes it impolite or even impossible to fundamentally question the sanctity of the ruling empire.

If you want to see how this network of propaganda operates, consider three recent cases: Nafta, Gatt, and Proposition 187. All three were important to the power elite. Nafta was a chance to expand the power of the managerial, regulatory, banking, and corporate elites within this hemisphere. But that's not what we were told. The propaganda network told us Nafta was free trade. If you opposed it, you were a protectionist.

And so every responsible, respectable, and seemingly reasonable voice was raised in defense of the Nafta trade bloc. Shills in the media, think tanks, large foundations, and big banks and corporations claimed it was wonderful. The Mises Institute and the *RRR* took a different course by actually examining the text.

Who ended up being correct about Nafta? The experts in the propaganda apparatus or principled free marketeers working with unconnected and productive Americans? Tariffs went down a tad, but as a corollary, the entire economy and political structure of Mexico, already socialist to the core, collapsed. The Mexican bailout, if the elites have their way, will lead to a world central bank to function as a lender (read: counterfeiter) of last resort for all U.S. client states.

When the power elite proposed the Gatt treaty, it didn't want a Nafta-style public debate. The deal was supposed to be about as important as the annual appropriation for the North American Tropical Tuna Commission. It didn't work out that way. Trained in the Nafta fight, the public was ready to make Gatt an issue. Eventually, it became even bigger than Nafta, with people more outraged than ever.

We are living through the most precarious and unpredictable times since 1860.

The propaganda organs of state power said the issue of Gatt was, again, protectionism versus free trade. But this time, nobody was buying it. Free trade obviously does not require the creation of a World Trade Organization, a bureaucratic monstrosity in Geneva, Switzerland.

Gatt is a mercantilist cartel of industrial governments. It makes possible endless subsidies to exports, more global regulations, and new barriers to imports from the rest of the world.

In both Nafta and Gatt, the propaganda engine of the state shifted into overdrive. In neither case did it work. People were not convinced. Both were jammed into law by the sheer force of intimidation. Nafta would have been impossible absent massive payoffs from the Mexican government. And Gatt was only made possible by the lame duck session of Congress. Even then, it could only happen with the full support of Gingrich and Dole.

Neither did the propaganda apparatus succeed with Proposition 187. Here was a measure that cut off public funds to illegal immigrants. It did not say they couldn't be educated, see a doctor, get a job, or rent an apartment. It said they could not do these things at taxpayer expense. No amount of propaganda, from whatever source, could make this perfectly reasonable idea into a hate crime, although the elites certainly tried.

But Prop. 187 was structured differently from Nafta and Gatt. It didn't rely for approval on party leaders, Executive offices, or any other kind of government dictate. The public had the chance to approve it and did, overwhelmingly.

In an act of brazen if familiar tyranny, a federal judge foiled the voters by delaying Prop. 187's implementation. But at least the public saw straight through the propaganda of the governing elites, and learned a valuable lesson about the present system.

These three events—followed up by the shocking bailout of Mexico—have educated and emboldened an already angry public into further acts of defiance. Some say these acts won't amount to much in the long run because authentic revolutions are impossible in stable democracies like ours. They're wrong. This country is far from stable. We are living through the most precarious and unpredictable times since 1860, when nobody knew for sure whether the U.S. would be one nation or two.

The ideological and economic divisions between the two classes in our society—the taxpayers and the tax-eaters—are deep and growing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The issues that create the divisions are essentially unsolvable through compromise. Something's got to give.

Consider international policy. The Cold War is over, and only the U.S. government doesn't want to recognize it. Is there any foreign war that could so threaten us that the U.S. should kill its young people and tax its citizens? Yet the warfare state continues to pretend as if real threats were permanent. The same is true of foreign aid. The governing elite once said we needed it because of the Cold War. Now foreign aid is exposed as welfare.

For forty years, the communist threat served to make the citizenry subservient to the government. Taxpayers are more willing to pay huge chunks of their income to the central state if they believe it is protecting them from foreign enemies. Only a few years ago, a president could depend on a foreign war to bolster his popularity. But no more.

Civil rights has created another unsolvable dilemma.

The fiasco of the Haitian invasion was a turning point. It was timed to help the Clinton administration in the November elections. Clinton knew that the polls showed the public to be opposed. Yet in previous wars, the public had always rallied around the flag once the troops were committed, and the president has always enjoyed a boost in support.

It didn't work this time. The taxpayers opposed the presence of American troops in Haiti from beginning to the end. And it didn't take body bags to turn the people against it. The invasion of Haiti and the ouster of its president went exactly as it was supposed to go. How could it not, given the tiny size of the country and the practical non-existence of a Haitian military, whose one tank was a rusted hulk? Yet the public raised its voice to say: Bring the Troops Home. The incident ended with Clinton even less popular than before.

The most unpopular provision in pollster Frank Luntz's Contract With America is the one calling for massively increased military spending. The U.S. already spends more in this area than all the rest of the world combined. Some freshmen, who rightly believe that spending is spending regardless of where it goes, are refusing to go along.

The press and the establishment frequently decry the foreign policy views of the public as isolationist. That's when you would rather trade with foreigners than bribe or bomb them. And so, of course, in a time when there's no good excuse for foreign wars, that's exactly what you can call the American people's foreign policy opinions.

The fissures on international politics grow deeper by the day. The governing elite will not and cannot give up the empire it has built and intends to expand. Meanwhile, the public cannot be tricked into liking it. These views cannot be reconciled. Eventually, something's got to give.

At the domestic level, there are dozens of issues which expose the intractable divisions between the rulers and the ruled. Primary among them is civil rights. The Americans With Disabilities Act has reduced an already bad idea to the level of farce. It has exposed the victimological racket for what it is.

Thanks to the ADA and all the other civil rights acts which preceded it, businesses no longer have the right to hire and fire as they see fit. Even maniacs who threaten the lives of other employees—people included among the officially disabled—can't be turned away for fear of risking lawsuits.

Civil rights was always bad law. It began as an effort to ban motivations the state doesn't like. In its original form, civil rights outlawed those actions taken with discriminatory intent.

That legally untenable position—the government can't read our minds, much as it would like to—eventually became quotas and affirmative action. Today, the manifest injustice of these policies is clear to all. The real victims have emerged on the political landscape, and they are making their voices heard.

Civil rights has created another unsolvable dilemma. By granting special privileges and immunities on grounds of race, the central state has created a middle class of victimologists whose living standards are unsustainable.

Many of these people have jobs through affirmative action in the private sector. Many more work for the government, where there is no profit and loss test or requirement that workers contribute something to the firm. Many have jobs in academia, where affirmative-action professors teach affirmative-action students about the glories of affirmative action.

The Republican leadership is attempting to do something about quotas and affirmative action, of course, but it heartily supports anti-discrimination law. But so long as the 1964 Civil Rights Act is law, quotas and race policies will be with us. We can repeal all the set asides we want, but until we get rid of the government's power to judge our intent, we will not have dealt with the real problem.

The neoconservatives are again attempting to trick the public with what appear to be half-way solutions. In fact, polls reveal that the public wants the whole racket dismantled, including the phony government jobs designed to artificially

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lift the living standards of the racially privileged. But if this happened, it would cause whole segments of the victimological middle class to collapse. One group can't live with it. Another group can't live without it. These are irreconcilable differences.

One prominent school of economic thought claims that the hope of rebellion is a vain one. The middle class is too dependent on the government, and demands more government subsidies, they say. Well, given how high taxes are, it would be a shock if the middle class did not demand something in return. And it's true that cutting off benefits such as Medicare and Social Security will be no easy task.

But this "Public Choice" analysis overlooks a key issue: the role that ideology plays in shaping history. It is the burning injustice of the present system, combined with anger and resentment at the elites who are ripping us off, that will cause people to set aside short-term economic interests. Centralization and state power can be reversed as they were advanced.

Even if we look at the cost and benefits of the welfare-warfare state, we see that the middle class receives far fewer benefits than it "buys" with taxes. Taxes are unbearable and buy nothing. Public schools are increasingly worthless, even in formerly protected suburban areas. Regulations are killing entrepreneurship.

Social insurance programs are going bankrupt. Savings are being looted by an expansionist credit policy for the benefit of socialist governments, banks, and Wall Street. The very essence of capitalism—the system of profit and loss—has been turned upside down. Profits go to the privileged, and they are legally protected from making losses. Losses go to everyone else, and the forgotten man is, in many case, legally prohibited from getting ahead.

This situation cannot and will not last. Just in the last few years, we have witnessed some extraordinary developments. The tenth amendment movement. The property rights movement. The militia movement. The secessionist movement. The tax resistance movement. The gun rights movement. The home schooling movement. The passage of 187. The affirmative action backlash. The near defeat of Nafta and Gatt. The public opposition to internationalism, which should really be called foreignism.

All this has been unleashed by the end of the Cold War and the emergence of Bill Clinton, the most hated president of the century.

The task before us is to push this rebellion to its appropriate ends and to secure the intellectual foundations for a fruitful liberty to replace our present tyranny.

How can we do this? The leftist revolution was first of all a revolution of ideas. Through our every effort, we must let our fellow citizens and the central state know that the intellectual and popular resistance is real and to be taken seriously. The goal is to reveal the unmentioned truth: that the central state is not only not necessary; it is wholly destructive, and will drive us to ruin unless our consent is withdrawn. Rebellion can succeed.

That rebellion must begin with right ideas. We must vigorously support alternatives to public education, academic corruption, and the D.C. non-profits. The Mises Institute and the *RRR* are the sort of organizations where your money and energy should go.

To restore the foundation that allowed our civilization to be free and to flourish, we must rebel—intellectually, culturally, and politically—against the system which is breaking the foundation apart. We can wait no longer. For we *can* restore what we have lost, and recapture the promise of American freedom. ■

P.C. Watch

by L.H.R., Jr.

Berlin in Harlem

Irving Berlin's original words to his great "Puttin' on the Ritz" (1930) aren't heard much anymore. Here they are, as sung by Fred Astaire:

Have you seen the well-to do,
Up on Lenox Avenue?
On that famous thoroughfare,
With their noses in the air?

High hat and colored collars,
White spats and fifteen dollars,
Spending every dime,
For a wonderful time

If you're blue and you
Don't know where to go to,
Why don't you go where
Harlem flits,
Puttin' on the ritz?

Spangled gowns upon the bevy,
Of high browns from
down the Levee,
All misfits.
Puttin' on the ritz.

That's where each and every
lulu belle goes,
Every Thursday evening
with her swell beaus,
Rubbin' elbows.

Come with me and we'll
attend their jubilee,
And see them spend their last
two bits.
Puttin' on the ritz.

Multiculturalism

Every morning at the Miami county courthouse, a special "voodoo squad" picks up the corpses of chickens, pigeons, and goats sacrificed during the previous night in voodoo ceremonies.

As Reuter's (4/11/95) explains,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"many of the criminal defendants in Dade County are Cuban and Haitian natives who turn to gods for little help with their legal troubles."

Often, judges and lawyers have to brush "voodoo powder" off their chairs, placed there during the night to harm them. Also found: corn kernels, to speed up the trial; eggs, which harm the prosecution; cake, which sweetens their attitude toward the defendant; and black pepper, to keep someone in jail.

What's the big fuss? asks Florida International University sociology professor Teresita Pedraza. All this demon worship is "just like Christianity."

New York, New York

A cover of the *New Yorker* magazine recently featured the Easter Bunny being crucified against a background of tax forms. Bill Donahue, head of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, denounced the magazine cover as "insulting to Christians," especially "at the start of Holy Week."

No apologies are due, said the artist Art Spiegelman. He was, he said, protesting the "Christian Right's drafting the tax issue into its political agenda." Oh. (Reuter's, 4/11/95)

Open University

New York Governor George Pataki has been denounced by faculty and students—who paraded with misspelled signs—for wanting to cut the budget of the City University of New York. But as Scott McConnell points out in the *New York Post* (3/15/95), cuts might be the place's salvation.

Once academically significant, after years of open admissions, CUNY is now engaged mostly in "remediation": teaching high-school subjects to inner-city kids who didn't get it the first time.

Do professors deserve very high salaries for pretending that the following represents college-level work? asks McConnell. In answer to the question, on an English exam, "What advice would you give Charles about memorizing data and passing tests?" a student wrote:

"I would tell Charles to read and then don't just stop and go do some thing else but to rectie and don't lay in bed and say you are studying but to move up and down and rectie. I would also tell him to do overlearning because the more you overlearn something you will be able to remembrance on a test. he can also use scheme that could help you to remembrance a lot more."

By the way, this was not written in a remedial course, but in regular English 110. The student received an A.

True Romance

Jim "has just about everything" that George "looks for in a companion," wrote David W. Dunlap in the *New York Times* (3/13/95). "Not just the stuff of romance": he "even shares" a "passion for collecting giraffe figurines." But Jim "has something else, something" that George "does not: H.I.V."

But like "many other gay men," they "have assimilated H.I.V. into their personal landscapes," although "it forces them to confront mortality" early in their "dating."

It is "virtually impossible—and, some say, unreasonably arbitrary—for gay men who are H.I.V.-negative to lead social lives that exclude those who are sero-positive," says the *Times*. Especially because AIDS carriers "include some of the most attractive, interesting, worthwhile bachelors in town."

Indeed, some homosexuals are "attracted to those with the virus." "Guys who are H.I.V.-positive are seen as living life more intensely," said Richard Elovich of the Gay Men's Health Crisis. "There's a fierceness" that's "sexy."

Racial Express, Part II

Last January, I told the story of Auburn Calloway, a black man selected for pilot training by the U.S. Navy through affirmative action, whose resentment and inability got him washed out. He was then hired through Flying Tiger's affirmative-action program, but then also let go because of his hostility and incompetence. After Federal Express bought Flying Tiger, however, Calloway was hired by Fedex because of the company's aggressive affirmative-action scheme. But his failings as a pilot combined with his antagonism towards white people led to many reprimands, and eventually even that company set a termination hearing for April 8, 1994.

On April 7, he was scheduled to fly a DC-10 as co-pilot out of Memphis. The pilot was a white man and the first officer was a white woman. Calloway planned to murder them both, he has since admitted, and then fly the fully fueled plane into Federal Express's national headquarters, with its thousands of employees, also hoping to ignite the hundreds of planes being refueled in the area at the time. It would have been the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history, by many magnitudes.

But the schedule was changed, and a new crew of three white men was assigned: pilot Dave Sanders, co-pilot Jim Tucker, and second officer Andre Peterson. The black man then asked to "deadhead," that is, to fly along for free. Calloway came on board carrying a guitar case, and sat in one of the few seats behind the cockpit. As the plane passed through 18,000 feet, he opened the case and removed two sledge hammers, a spear gun, and a combat knife. He then entered the cockpit and smashed Tucker and Peterson in the head with a sledge hammer, fracturing Peterson's skull front and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

back, and driving slivers of bone into Tucker's brain. Calloway then aimed his spear gun at the captain, whose head he had also smashed, planning to kill all three and then carry out the rest of his plan.

The co-pilot managed to throw the giant plane into a roll, pinning the black man against the ceiling. As the two other men struggled with the large, well-built criminal, the co-pilot asked for an emergency return to Memphis, and put the plane on autopilot: "We need an ambulance and, uh, we need, uh, armed intervention as well," he said during the fight. It took 25 minutes for the crippled pilots to disarm the would-be mass murderer, who had a black belt in karate, and was willing to die so long as he took white people with him.

The pilot had his ear torn off, and all three were bitten badly by Calloway. When the plane landed, the black man tried to kill a paramedic and then escape via the emergency chute, but he was finally handcuffed.

Today, one of the white men is completely disabled. Another's head is oddly shaped, and he's unable to think clearly, and the reattachment of the pilot's ear was not entirely successful. These men are heroes, but you've never heard of them, and the massacre they prevented. If the culprit had been a white man, this would have been one of the most important stories of the year. Since he wasn't, the free press did its usual job of cover-up.

Then on March 26, 1995, when AP finally reported the story almost a year after the fact, it mentioned nothing about race and Calloway's motives, and played down Calloway's plans. Worse, the story implied that Tucker, Peterson, and Sanders were too rough on Calloway because they hit him with a hammer that Calloway had brought on board!

Calloway, who was not permanently injured, is claiming that he is innocent by reason of temporary insanity, and given the jury composition, he may indeed be freed to try to kill again. ◙

The Ascent of the Kristols

by Paul Gottfried

The ascent of the Kristol family since the 1950s as America's most celebrated political intellectuals reveals more shadow than substance. It dramatizes the adage that it may be more profitable merely to appear than to be provocative. Despite their putative association with the political Right, the Kristols have not had to endure unkindness from the press or visual media. Irving and now Bill have in fact enjoyed praise from those who delight in salvaging anyone even a millimeter to the right of Bill Clinton.

Bill Kristol has done nothing that would qualify as an extraordinary intellectual accomplishment.

Yes, Bill is presented as the advisor of religious maniacs, assorted homophobes, and of that boobish former vice president Dan Quayle, but he himself is seen to stand above his silly and even sinister advisees. How this can be is never explained. If young Kristol did so well as Quayle's domestic advisor, why did his boss, according to the press, look so bad as vice president? Why between 1988 and 1992, that is to say, did journalists exalt Kristol's managing of Quayle while simultaneously running down the person being managed? It is doubtful that Bill's boosters have much evidence to point to when they refer to him as the "brains" of both the Republican Party and the conservative movement. Certainly Kristol has done nothing that would qualify as an extraordinary intellectual accomplishment. Perusing the entry for him in the latest *Who's Who* (1994 edition), it seems that there is nothing of genuine moment he has accomplished in his first forty-two years, except for a lucky choice of parents who have greased the skids for him. A recipient of Bradley Foundation money, an advisor to a mentally dull vice president allied to the neoconservatives, and a Ph.D. from a poli sci department at Harvard lubricated with neocon dollars, Bill has now turned his attention to the Project for the Republican Future. This he has done while being comfortably juxtaposed at AEI to big daddy's office and while having access to the usual neocon fatcats: So much for a self-made career! In one garrulous attempt to hide the obvious, feature writer John Sedgwick asserts in *Newsweek* in early January: "If there was a single act that determined the outcome of the [November] election, it was probably the memo the Kristol wrote on December 2, 1993, declaring that the Clinton health care plan was dead and that the Republicans should try to kill it outright. Even though public support for the plan was dwindling at the time, it was a daring position." Moreover, explains, Sedgwick, Kristol had to claw his way back into public view after taking prin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipled stands against George Bush. "The surprising part was that anyone paid attention to Kristol at all. His tiny Project for the Republican Future was not exactly the Heritage Foundation. It lacked only a basketball hoop over the trash basket to come across as a dormitory for poli sci postgrads. And it has been running for only a month. But there was something arresting about Kristol's the-sky-is-not-falling message, not to mention his supremely confident tone."

There are of course easily discoverable misstatements in this sticky praise. Republicans Phil Gramm, Dick Armey, Ron Paul, and Pat Buchanan all opposed the Clinton health plan from the outset, and as its popularity dwindled there was no way that Congressional Republicans would support it, with or without Bill Kristol's memo. His Project for the Republican Future was never a hand-to-mouth operation. It had millions of dollars pledged to it from neocon philanthropies before its office were even opened. In a feature story on "young, brainy, and ambitious" neocons by neocon-supported James Atlas in the February 12 *Sunday New York Times Magazine*, the sources mentioned for Kristol's annual budget, 1.3 million dollars, are Wall Street connections. At the present time Bill Kristol's exercise in postgraduate conversation is well off the ground. It has at least a dozen full-time employees, hosts dinners for incoming Republican Congressmen, and his family friends at *Newsweek*, *Washington Post*, and the *New York Times* handling its PR, without pay.

The Kristols are the liberal Left's most trivial and least offensive critics.

There is nothing remarkable in the fact that other neocons venerate the Kristols. And thus while it may be sickening to read such purple prose, it is understandable that George Will would be serving this up for good friends. "The two most important months in Washington's history were June 1790 and June 1987. In June 1790 Jefferson and Hamilton met in Manhattan and agreed. Jefferson would support Hamilton's plan for national assumption of states' debts. Hamilton would support Jefferson's plan for moving the capital south from New York. In June 1987, Bea Kristol moved here from New York with her husband Irving. He is a one-man critical mass, whose move symbolized the movement of the nation's center of intellectual gravity from New York to the right. She is a distinguished historian who writes under the name Gertrude Himmelfarb."

It may be irrelevant for contextualizing Will's remarks (made in April 1990) that they contain so little truth. Far from being an intellectual dynamo, Irving Kristol has spent most of his eighty-four years as a fund-raiser, who also does journalism. Of scholarship he has done none that I'm aware of. His wife, by contrast, used to write scholarship, but has stayed away from it since her study of John Stuart Mill in 1974, except for a few passable essays on Victorian social morality. It is mostly hodge-podges of political polemics that Himmelfarb now passes off as historical studies.

The chief contemporary writing by the Kristol family consist of newspaper pieces and publicized memos. The memos are directed not only at family retainers in subservient foundations but also at politicians, with copies sent to drooling journalists. That George Will is among this group should occasion no surprise. He is an almost weekly visitor at the apartment of Irv's and Bea's and like them, is known as a "respectable" conservative: in a profession abounding with Jewish liberals, Will loudly deplored anti-Semitism, demands that we speak more about the Holocaust, supports the hawks in Israeli politics, and exalts the 1964 Civil Rights Act as "liberalism's finest hour." In short, Will is the Kristol's kind of conservative, someone who alternates his calls for fiscal restraint and more "values" in public education with a properly attuned Northeast Corridor sensitivity.

But why do Mr. Sedgwick and the editorial boards of Eastern liberal newspapers join the neocons in swooning over the Kristols? Nothing this family has done betokens high intellectual gifts — or leads me to believe that it occupies any lofty eminence in Charles Murray's cognitive elite. The Kristols have admittedly mastered an art form, knowing how to manipulate the idle scions of John M. Olin and Smith Richardson. No one may be better at taking money from ne'er-do-well heirs by telling them just enough before the onset of Attention Deficit Syndrome.

Irving has also been good at staffing foundations ripe for takeover. He fills them, predictably, with minicon infiltrators and with reliable glad handers, some in possession of phantom Ph.D.s. The Kristols also have spent years entertaining press dignitaries, self-important publishers, and politicians in need of handlers. But none of this suggests lustrous brilliance, so much as persistence in making one's way in the world, with the help of wealthy connections. That they have developed these connections again suggests talent but nothing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more. Irv has convinced moneybags that what they really want is not free markets but something called "democratic capitalism," the present federal welfare state with corporate tax reductions and an activist foreign policy bound to secure international markets. Kristol has sold his corporate contributors on the need to defend this kind of government, with Republicans, flanked by neocons, in charge. The appeal of this argument has not only aided the neocons' material successes but also advanced the Kristols within the neocon nomenclature.

Of all representatives of what Sam Francis calls the "harmless persuasion," it is the Kristols who are the liberal Left's most trivial and least offensive critics. This of course makes them respected within the big business community. As several corporate executives in Lancaster County recently observed to me, most of their colleagues admire the Kristols, "because liberal journalists take them seriously." The truth is exactly the opposite. Liberals praise this first family of neoconservatism, because it does so little to oppose them.

Rothbard-Rockwell Report (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Second-Class Postage paid at Burlingame, CA 94010 and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Rothbard-Rockwell Report, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editors:* Murray N. Rothbard (1926–1995) and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors:* Sarah Barton, Paul Gottfried, Joe Melton, Justin Raimondo, and Joseph Sobran. *Publisher:* Burton S. Blumert. Managing Editor: Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Single issue: $5. Copyright ©1995 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

Within the Kristol dynasty, however, the most trivial and pampered member is young Bill. It is he who understands best the need to be bland while having others pretend to vibrate in his presence. His true judgment power came through when he advised two friends and presidential hopefuls Bill Bennett and Jack Kemp, to go out to California and campaign against Prop. 187. That way they could show that they were scorning the extreme Right — while keeping faith with Bill's liberal friends. That strategy backfired to the detriment of Kemp and Bennett, when Californians overwhelmingly voted to cut off social services to illegal aliens. Even so, Bill emerged on election night as the journalists' choice for best Republican strategist. The reasons soon became apparent. Throughout the month of February Bill kept popping up on network TV to warn us against moving too quickly against affirmative action. Though a "wedge issue," in the words of Bill Clinton, this codeword for quotas, as Bill explained, must be phased out slowly. Otherwise we could not be sure that sufficient safeguards were in place to protect minorities against discrimination. There are of course multiple safeguards against even the suspicion of improper discrimination at the state and federal levels alike. The remaining danger, even if we ditched the federal quotas, is that history would repeat itself. As in the sixties we would move from antidiscrimination enforcement back into quotas within a few years. Such a march would be dictated by the fear of government suits being brought against those who failed to hire enough minorities.

Interpreting goyim is one thing, but having to break bread with them, in Jackson, Miss., may be quite another.

I assume that Bill knows all of this despite his predictably conventional statements. Still it is startling how little reflectiveness informs his public utterances. It was Bill who warned the victors against change after the November election, an event that he himself had just likened to the "Bolshevik Revolution in reverse." Aside from its silliness (as far as I can see, no tsarist restoration has occurred in the U.S.), the parallel jarred with Kristol's later statements, reported by Lew Rockwell, that Republicans should not rock any boats, but only prepare to win back the presidency in '96. Here young Kristol expresses the overriding concerns of all Washington-based operators, including the press corps, to keep the political game where it is and to maintain a public sector from which they can benefit. What would happen (Heaven forbid!), if a real devolution of power occurred? How would it affect the neocons and their minicon progeny if they had to run around to state capitals selling their services, and could no longer deal out of DC? Such activities could get expensive. They also might bring the neocons into closer contact with Middle Americans, and, as James Atlas notes, the smart people from New York are still trying to explain to their crowd, and perhaps to themselves, about Middle Americans "who eat Wonder bread and mayonnaise." Interpreting goyim is one thing, but having to break bread with them, in Jackson, Miss., may be quite another.

Getting back to Atlas's intended snow job, it seems that no-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where else is neocon vacuity so thoroughly in evidence. None of the middle-aged celebrities featured here is "young and brainy," and the page-length, colored photos of Bill, Richard Brookhiser, and Adam Bellow, which cost the *New York Times* megabucks in nonused advertising space, testifies to how shamelessly liberals dote on their phony opposition. As for Atlas's motives in confecting this text, the less said the better. His subjects, or one of their pet foundations, the Manhattan Institute, are funding generously his biography of neocon groupie Saul Bellow. In Atlas's monument to tastelessness, there is, however, one useful datum, the remarks by Bill Kristol about feminist politics. He's delighted with its past victories and would not want to sacrifice the "political progress on equal right for women." What he wants us to consider is the "big question where we go from here." But what would be his response to the other "big questions"? Which government programs does he still support for the sake of "political progress on equal rights," a project Kristol found acceptable up until February 12, 1995? Does he approve of all of the directives instituted to achieve that goal, including job quotas and guidelines for equal pay for women? Or, perhaps he only approved of them provisionally, until February of this year, when it became socially possible to cease approving of them, without having mainstream journalists on his case. And what should we now do to hold down those empowered to implement the equal rights whose enforcement Bill presumably endorsed up until two months ago? As I look at the looming photo of this neocon dynast staring into vacant space in the *Sunday New York Times*, I know he has no interest in addressing these matters. Why the Hell should he? Like his parents he has made his way by not offending the liberal establishment. Bill has enjoyed a very modern ascent to distinction; and he might there take as his own variation on the Beatitudes: Blessed are the inconsequential, for they shall inherit newspaper and foundation connections!

Dr. Gottfried is Professor of Political Philosophy at Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania. ■

Recently discovered Rothbard-at-college video...

Rothbard skins Clinton

Dear Subscriber:

Murray was one hell-raiser when he spoke. He was polite and soft-spoken, but when he took off after the inanities of our so-called leaders, he could be brutal.

This video, recorded live in June of '94 at a major California university, is Murray at his rollicking, outrageous best. What a destruct job he did on Clinton! What the IRS does to you and me, he did to Clinton: peeked into all those private little places. In this speech, just rediscovered by an incredible skein of serendipitous events, Murray...

- Demolishes Clinton's much bally-hooed "Workfare" program, and shows how it will actually get MORE people onto welfare, costing more of your bucks and mine, not less.
- Clinton's a back-door man, regulatorily as well as culturally. And Murray nails him beautifully on his backdoor scheme to get your guns. Unnoticed as yet by the NRA, Murray shows how the overt regulatory schemes have little impact. But this backdoor method — supported by Gingrich — WILL disarm America if allowed to go unchallenged.
- Why Clinton's (and Gingrich's) talk of cutting the deficit is a knowing lie. No truth, whatsoever to it.
- How Clinton's "National Service" program" — that the neo-cons ooh and ahh over — is nothing more than another huge, tax-payer funded boondoggle.
- Why the Reagan/Bush/Clinton "War on Drugs" has led to the enormous surge in violent crime, despite its professed goals to the contrary.

If you want to have a good time and learn how to stop neocon arguments cold, send in $39 to the Rothbard-Rockwell Report, Box 4091, Burlingame, California 94010. Or call 800-325-7265 and ask for Elise. If you want to help us keep the good fight going, please send something extra. If you send us $100 in all, I'll send you a nice surprise present. Not a great big deal, but I think you're really going to like it, too.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED